DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 290 SP 014 257

AUTHOR Elliott, Eddie M.
TITLE The Evaluation of Faculty and Non-Academic Administrators.
NOTE 7p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; *Staff Improvement; *Supervisory Activities

ABSTRACT

Objectives and processes for evaluation of faculty and nonacademic administrators are presented. The objectives include: (1) increase the opportunities for open communication between supervisor and supervised; (2) provide written role expectations; (3) provide a means of assessing and evaluating the degree to which expectations are met; (4) provide opportunity for those evaluated to make objections; (5) provide a framework through which personnel achievement may be noted; and (6) develop a data base regarding personnel strengths and needs. Nine steps are outlined for the evaluation process based on the above objectives and specific administrative procedures. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170290

The Evaluation

of

Faculty and Non-Academic Administrators

by

Eddie M. Elliott, Ed.D.
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Wayne State College, Wayne, Nebraska

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Eddie M. Elliott
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP014257

Introduction

Personnel evaluation has several purposes. At least two of the purposes are explicit within the process identified below and cannot (and perhaps should not be) separated. One purpose is for recognition and award; the other is for personal growth and development--professional improvement. Institutional reward structures differ significantly and it is therefore difficult to generalize the procedures and the process. Additionally, it is implicit within the concept of personal improvement and professional development and the results of evaluation must be individualized. However, it should be mentioned at the outset, that we must be able, through the evaluation process, to identify general areas of strength as well as areas of concern that can be subsequently addressed.

Objectives

The following represent some of the current objectives of the annual faculty and non-academic administrator evaluative process:

a) To increase the opportunities and possibilities for open communication between the supervisor and the person being supervised. With the possibilities for increased communication, it is hoped that each person involved in the process will better understand what he/she is expecting of others and what is expected of oneself.

b) To provide written individual role descriptions and role expectations which may be annually revised.

c) To provide a means of assessing and evaluating the degree to which the role descriptions and role expectations have been met.

d) To provide all individuals being evaluated with an opportunity to

voice objections to decisions reached about their performance or about the evaluative process.

e) To provide a framework through which personnel achievement may be noted.

f) To augment data regarding personnel strengths and to develop a data base regarding personnel needs.

Process

The evaluative device used on our campus is designed to accommodate the diverse role and function activities of faculty and non-academic administrators. The process also provides that general criteria be identified for faculty and non-academic administrators. Activities performed by faculty and non-academic administrators which relate to each of the general criteria and which are appropriate to the individual's responsibilities are identified as a part of the role description.

An example of a criterion upon which all faculty members may be evaluated is student advisement. All faculty members at this particular institution are involved in some way with student advisement. It is assumed that program improvement will develop as the institution becomes better prepared to identify the significant components of the advisor-advisee relationship. Following this example, through the evaluative process it is possible to develop a data base regarding the kinds of activities needed to improve faculty/student relationships, or to garner from students an evaluation of the faculty, student attitudes regarding the advisement process, career goal advising, and assessments of student's own personal needs. (To that end, the Vice President for Academic Affairs has asked the Director of Academic Advising to create an Ad Hoc Committee to study the advising process and to conduct a needs assessment.)

A minimum of two individual conferences are held with each person annually. A conference with each faculty member and each non-academic administrator to develop the upcoming year's job targets should be completed no later than May 30 of each year. It is from this conference that criteria to be used in the upcoming annual evaluation are developed.

During the May conference, each supervisor is responsible for assigning weights to the various mutually agreeable activities. Variations in specific cases are allowed when agreed upon. In cases where a difference of opinion exists, the weights are assigned by the supervisor who is, in turn, responsible for summarizing in writing the difference of opinion and the weights finally assigned to the various job responsibilities. A copy of the written assignment must be provided to the faculty member. The supervisor must complete an evaluative instrument for each faculty member or non-academic administrator annually.

Within the academic division, the responsibilities of the Division Head in completing the evaluative instrument include:

1) to complete the evaluative instrument based upon information available--or provide the faculty member the opportunity to do a self-analysis and to complete the evaluative instrument based upon information available;
2) to advise each faculty member of strengths and concerns based upon the evaluative process;
3) to recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs appropriate action based upon the overall recommendation. (The overall recommendation is to be either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. If the Division Head believes that, as a result of the evaluative process and the activities performed during the year, a Meritorious desig-

nation is warranted, this must be designated within the narrative of the evaluative device. This process is also applicable to non-academic administrators under the jurisdiction of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.)

4) The supervisor is responsible to identify the relative weights assigned to all criteria. The percentages under each of the general criteria should total 100 percent.

5) Each supervisor is responsible for indicating (for each of the job descriptions or job targets) whether the candidate should be rated positively, negatively, or satisfactory. The supervisor is also responsible for evaluating each of the general criteria indicating his/her evaluation by writing P for positive, N for negative, or S for satisfactory. (If there is an inadequate basis for judgment, it is noted at the appropriate point.)

6) Each supervisor is responsible for indicating the means used to arrive at the evaluation. For example, the evaluation may be based upon class observation, informal discussion with students, formal discussions with students, formal or informal discussions with peers, consultation with the person being evaluated, general observations, professional judgment, or some other means of data collection. Where possible, the supervisor is responsible to append supportive evidence to the evaluative instrument. This responsibility is also incumbent upon the person being evaluated.

7) After all general criteria have been evaluated, the supervisor is responsible for preparing an overall recommendation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory, together with any explanatory comments.

8) In all cases the results of the evaluation are shared with the person being evaluated. In the case of faculty members, after the Division Head has completed the appropriate portion of the evaluative device, the evaluation is discussed with and signed by the faculty member and the Division Head and then forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for further action. (For non-academic administrators, the Vice President for Academic Affairs verbally reviews with each individual the contents of the recommendation.)

9) A copy of the yearly evaluation signature sheet is automatically provided to the faculty member after it has been signed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President.

Conclusion

The current practice on our particular campus is to globally identify and categorize strengths and concerns which come to our attention as a result of the aforementioned evaluative process and then to attempt institutionally to deal with them. This occurs in addition to individual personnel decisions and the resulting institutional support provided for professional development which are derived from the evaluative process.